

2009 Why do you often talk about the ego as a "personalized entity"

[Speaker 1] (0:01 - 4:43)

From Vince, in *The Power of Now* and in *A New Earth*, the way you describe the ego makes it sound like it has a personality of its own. It seems to be a collection of habits, desires, etc. that run counter to some deeper or more authentic dimension of reality.

What are the benefits and potential downsides to describing ego as a personalized entity rather than, say, as a more impersonal pattern? The question then, I'll just repeat it or paraphrase it, what is the advantage or the downside of talking about the ego in terms of an entity as if it were a personalized entity, or talking about the ego as simply a collection of impersonal patterns, mental, emotional patterns? The questioner mentions that I often talk about the ego as if it were an entity in itself.

So what are the benefits and potential downsides to talking about it as if it were an entity? Because these two are just two ways of looking at it. If you look at it in one way, it is like a person, like a being that wants to survive.

So this conglomeration of patterns working together, it wants to survive, it has certain needs, so it has certain characteristics of an entity. And that's why the the the downside of looking at it as an entity is that it might scare you. You may get scared, you might get scared of your own ego and think there's some demon inside me that wants to take over my life.

So that's the downside, then, is it creates some kind of emotion around it and you feel threatened by it. If you call it it's a collection of patterns, then you don't have that. But the downside of that is that you may underestimate the force behind it and the, it's the persistence behind the patterns and the fact that they are, the patterns are they have a certain organization to them, a certain, they kind of go together, they reinforce each other.

So there the downside is that you underestimate the egos. And you say, well, there's still some unconscious patterns in me. That's you probably won't even say that, but anyway, that's, you have the two ways of looking.

Neither one is the one right way. Another, I can add a third way of looking at the ego, which is to say it's an illusion. That's the Eastern approach, in many cases, to say the ego is an illusion.

Or you can even have a saying, the ego doesn't exist, it's just an illusion. And again, everything is a somewhat limited perspective and every perspective will have it's helpful, in some ways maybe helpful, and in other ways has a, as the questioner says, a

downside to it. So not one perspective really can encapsulate the ego.

So you can really have, there's no need to embrace just one perspective. Realize that the ego is, it is a personalized entity, it is and consisting of a conglomeration of mental emotional patterns, and it is ultimately a dream-like entity, an illusory form. It's all that together, you could say.

And so that's then there's also no disagreement between one person saying there is no ego because it's an illusion, and the other one says, oh yes, there is. There's just two viewpoints, perspectives. Ego is of course the unobserved mind, plus its emotions.